

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No. 10/532,361	Applicant(s) MCNAMARA ET AL.	
	Examiner JYOTHSNA A. VENKAT	Art Unit 1619	

All Participants:

(1) JYOTHSNA A. VENKAT.

(2) Jonathan D. Ball.

Date of Interview: 21 July 2010

Type of Interview:

☒ Telephonic

☐ Video Conference

☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description: _____

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:
102 and 103 rejections

Claims discussed:
as of record

Prior art documents discussed:
JP 9-77629 and U. S. Patent 6,096, 702 ('702) and U. S. Patent 4,559,057 ('057)

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:
See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

/JYOTHSNA A VENKAT /
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1619

Status of Application: NON FINAL

(3) Charles J. Zeller.

(4) William Mcnamara(inventor).

Time: _____

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: examiner informed the attorney that written description rejection is withdrawn and examiner also informed the attorneys that the composition claims are obvious over the combination of JP '629 and patent '702 and patent '057. Examiner also informed the attorney that claim 34 is allowed with respect to eyelashes and also to submit terminal disclaimer over the co-pending applications 10/331,069 and 10/502,061. Attorneys agreed to submit terminal disclaimers. Examiner also informed the attorneys that claim 25 is unclear and does not limit the scope of claim 24 at line 2, regarding "are stearic acid, palmitic acid, myristic acid". Attorney agreed and authorized the examiner by examiners amendment to incorporate the limitation of claim 35, (which is limited to eyelashes) into claim 34 and deleting "hair of the scalp and eyebrows" in claim 34 and change the dependency of remaining composition claims 3-9, 16, 22-23, 26-33, 60 and 67 amending claim 26 and amending claims 61 and 68 by deleting "comprises" and changing the dependency of claims 61 to 60 and claim 68 to claim 67 and cancelling claims 1-2, 11, 13, 35-41, 43-44, 50-58, 62-66 and 69-70.